[31st January 1931

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—"I cannot be clearer than that."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—"Is this money given out of the Police budget, Sir?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—"Not all, I think. As we give such rewards in various departments, they must come from the amounts allotted to them."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—"Are we to take it, Sir, that in addition to the amount already provided for in the Police budget, for which you also took sanction from us the other day, some other departments are also incurring expenditure in connexion with the civil disobedience movement?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—"I think so, Sir; but if you want definite information, you must ask the hon. Members concerned."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED :—"May I know whether Mr. Raju Pillai has been made permanent Deputy Superintendent and, if so, is it in recognition of his meritorious services and, if so, what is the kind of meritorious service rendered by him?"

(No reply.)

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—"It is said in answer to clause (*d*) that 'no rewards have been given to any Magistrates for their services *as such*'. May I know if any *other* rewards were given to the Magistrates?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—"No."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—"May I know from the hon. the Finance Member whether his financial check did not receive a rude shock when moneys were being given as rewards for counteracting the civil disobedience movement?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES :—"Notice of the question, Sir."

Government Press

Production of admission certificates by Government Press employees returning from sick leave.

*330 Q.—Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Superintendent, Government Press, Madras, has informed all the employees of the Government Press of the necessity of submitting admission certificates as soon as they place themselves for treatment under private medical practitioners or in the hospitals; if so, when;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that, in a petition, dated 9th July 1930, the employees of the Press and Machine Department, Mint Buildings, asked the Superintendent among other things for the procedure to be adopted by them in case they place themselves for treatment under private medical practitioners or in the hospitals and that the Superintendent did not put them in the way;

31st January 1931]

(c) whether it is a fact that they also requested the Superintendent in the said petition that proper enquiries may be made in their presence on reports preferred against them at their back and the charges against them may be proved, before they are punished; and

(d) if the answer to (c) be in the affirmative, whether the Superintendent complied with their request; and, if not, why not?

A.—(a) The Superintendent, Government Press, posted a notice in all sections of the Press on 24th June 1922 summarizing the rules governing the grant of leave. One such rule was to the effect that if a public servant desires to prove for any official purpose that he has been under the professional treatment of any medical practitioner, he shall obtain from such practitioner an admission and a discharge certificate showing commencement and termination of treatment.

(b) (i) Yes.

(ii) The Superintendent, Government Press, in his written reply to the petition, did not detail at length the procedure to be followed in the circumstances stated; but he supplemented his written reply in a personal discussion with several of the petitioners and has heard nothing further from them in the matter.

(c) Yes.

(d) The statutory rules require that in disciplinary cases against Government servants proper enquiries should be made in their presence and that the charges should be proved before they are punished. They have a right of appeal if the procedure is not complied with or if for any other reason they consider that they have not been rightly punished, and this the Superintendent, in his written reply, pointed out to the petitioners.

Police

Gaming houses at the People's Park.

*331 *Q.*—Mr. V. T. Arasu: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that during the Christmas week of every year the South Indian Athletic Association, Limited, keeps a large number of common gaming houses at the People's Park;

(b) whether the Commissioner of Police permitted these gaming houses;

(c) if so, under what section of the Madras City Police Act; and

(d) if not, why the South Indian Athletic Association, Limited, has not been prosecuted under section 45 of the City Police Act?

A.—(a) No, the only games permitted by the South Indian Athletic Association, Limited, in Christmas week in the People's Park were games of skill.

(b) Gaming houses were not permitted by the Commissioner of Police.

(c) & (d) Do not arise.